

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed October 16, 2003, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitfield. Moreover, claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitfield in view of Knab. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.


By the above amendment, claims 13-17 have been cancelled without prejudice and new claim 18 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claim 18 is of substantially the same scope as claims 13-17, and it is claimed in combination with a work table.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *MPEP 2131*. New claim 18 recites a combination with a work table comprising a support base, a work surface having a plurality of airflow slots thereon, a peripheral edge, a plurality of airflow slots on the peripheral edge, a placing unit, comprising an emitting unit supported above the work surface having a plurality of vanes for providing a laminar airflow through the plurality of airflow slots on the work surface and the plurality of airflow slots on the peripheral edge, a filter screen disposed on the emitting unit, a filter unit, a suction tube having a first end and a second end, the first end of the suction tube is operatively connected to the filter unit, and the

second end of the suction tube is operatively connected to the plurality of slots on the work surface and the plurality of slots on the peripheral edge. Neither Whitfield nor Knab, taken individually or in combination, teaches these limitations as now required by claim 18. More specifically, the prior does not teach or suggest a combination of a work table having a support base, a work surface having a plurality of airflow slots thereon, a peripheral edge, a plurality of airflow slots on the peripheral edge with a placing unit having the limitations recited in new claim 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is patentable over the prior art.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed October 16, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claim 18 is now in condition for allowance. Wherefore, examination and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennison, Schultz,
Dougherty & MacDonald

By: 
Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16